

REMARKS

The Office Action dated January 23, 2008 has been received and carefully noted.

The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 15, 16, and 18 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. New claims 19-24 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-24 are, therefore, currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 8-12, 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunton (U.S. Patent No. 7,095,798) in view of Miao (U.S. Patent No. 7,305,057). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunton in view of Miao, and further in view of Wright (U.S. Patent No. 7,061,990). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that the Office Action has failed to provide a prima facie case for obviousness. More specifically, Applicants submit that Miao does not constitute a valid prior art reference with respect to the present application. Miao has a filing date of July 7, 2003, while the present application has an effective filing date of May 28, 2003 based on the priority claim to the corresponding Great Britain Application. Therefore, the present application has an effective filing date, May 28, 2003, which is prior to the

filings date of Miao. As such, Miao cannot be properly cited as prior art against the current application. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

The Office Action indicated that claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, since the Office Action has failed to properly reject the claims upon which claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 are dependent, Applicants submit that claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 should be allowed in their current form.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that all of claims 1-24 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Majid S. AlBassam
Registration No. 54,749

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time